

**REMARKS**

Claims 22-25 and 29-42 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1-21 and 26-28 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 7,149,524 to Reynolds (hereinafter “Reynolds”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,580,390 to O’Shea (hereinafter “O’Shea”) and further in view of PCT Patent Application No. WO01/65881 to Kauhanen (hereinafter “Kauhanen”). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, for at least the reason that these references do not teach or suggest (emphasis added) “translating, *in the WTRU*, the QoS requirements defined according to the first wireless communication system to QoS requirements defined according to a second wireless communication system of a second type” as recited in claim 22.

The current Office Action admits that Reynolds fails to teach the above-highlighted features of claim 22. The current Office Action asserts, however, that O’Shea teaches these features. O’Shea teaches facilitating reducing frequency errors during transitions between wireless communication systems by using frequency estimation information from one system when transitioning to another. *See*, O’Shea column 2, line 65- column 3, line 2. O’Shea further teaches the

estimated frequency offset is translated to an equivalent frequency error in the GSM band and applied to one or more rotators to adjust the frequency of the received GSM signal. This translation is achieved by first calculating the current frequency offset being applied in the W-CDMA system as a ratio of the ideal carrier frequency to the current frequency of operation and then using this ratio to convert the frequency offset for W-CDMA to the frequency offset for GSM. *See*, O'Shea column 7, lines 25-45.

O'Shea fails to teach "translating, in the WTRU, the QoS requirements defined according to the first wireless communication system to QoS requirements defined according to a second wireless communication system of a second type." O'Shea teaches translating a frequency offset when handover from the W-CDMA system to the GSM system is performed. However, this frequency offset taught by O'Shea is *not* a QoS requirement. The frequency offset is simply a measurement. Thus, O'Shea does not suggest the concept of "translating . . . QoS requirements" or, more specifically (emphasis added) "translating, in the WTRU, the QoS requirements" as recited in claim 22.

Kauhanen also does not teach or suggest (emphasis added) "translating, in the WTRU, the QoS requirements" as recited in claim 22. Kauhanen is cited in the current Office Action as teaching the general concept of "translated QoS requirements." Kauhanen teaches handover of a mobile station from the Mobile

Switching Center (MSC) of a packet switched UMTS network to the MSC of a circuit switched GSM network. The mobile station uses a set of “default parameters” to establish bearers in the target GSM network, and Kauhanen describes that the default parameters are obtained based on “mapping from the UMTS side bearer quality of service (QoS).” Kauhanen, page 12, lines 17-18. Kauhanen describes that this “mapping” is performed only by controller elements in the network, such as the MSCs. This is shown on page 13, lines 4-9 of Kauhanen, which are reproduced as follows:

The determination of the appropriate default values for the parameters may be accomplished by the target MSC 12. It should be appreciated that the determination may also be accomplished by the source MSC 16 i.e. the previous controller or any other appropriate controller element of the communication system.
--

Nowhere, however, does Kauhanen teach that the “mapping” is performed by the mobile station. Thus, Kauhanen does not teach or suggest (emphasis added) “translating, *in the WTRU*, the QoS requirements defined according to the first wireless communication system to QoS requirements defined according to a second wireless communication system of a second type.”

For the above reasons, Reynolds, O’Shea, and Kauhanen, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest, “translating, in the WTRU, the QoS requirements defined according to the first wireless communication system to QoS

requirements defined according to a second wireless communication system of a second type” as recited in claim 22. For at least this reason, claim 22 is non-obvious over this combination.

Claims 25, 29-34 and 36-41 are also rejected as obvious over the combination of Reynolds, O’Shea, and Kauhanen. Claims 29 and 36, though not identical to claim 22, contain similar elements to claim 22. The Applicants believe these claims are non-obvious over the combination of Reynolds, O’Shea, and Kauhanen for the similar reasons to those provided above regarding claim 22. Claims 23-25, 30-35, and 37-42 depend on claims 22, 29, and 35, and the Applicants believe that these claims are non-obvious over this combination for at least the same reasons presented above.

Claims 35 and 42 are rejected as obvious over Reynolds in view of O’Shea and Kauhanen, as applied to claims 29 and 36 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,092,374 to Gubbi (hereinafter “Gubbi”). Gubbi does not cure the deficiencies of Reynolds, O’Shea, and Kauhanen, and so claims 29 and 36 are non-obvious over the combination of Reynolds, O’Shea, and Kauhanen, and Gubbi. Claims 35 and 42 are non-obvious over this combination at least by virtue of their respective dependencies upon claims 29 and 36.

For the reasons set forth above, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claims 22-25 and 29-42 is respectfully requested.

**Applicant:** Hunkeler et al.  
**Application No.:** 10/679,804

**Conclusion**

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephonic interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Hunkeler et al.

By /Melissa B. Thompson/  
Melissa B. Thompson  
Registration No. 66,776

Volpe and Koenig, P.C  
United Plaza  
30 South 17th Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4009  
Telephone: (215) 568-6400  
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

JEM/MBT/hg